

References

- Benjamini, Y., & Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *The Annals of Statistics*, 29(4), 1165–1188.
- Borman, G., Hewes, G. M., Overman, L. T., & Brown, S. (2003). Comprehensive school reform and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(2), 125–230.
- Boser, J., & Clark, S. (1995). *Factors influencing mail survey response rates: What do we really know?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS.
- Browder, D. M., Fallin, K., Davis, S., & Karvonen, M. (2003). Consideration of what may influence student outcomes on alternate assessments. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38, 255–270.
- Church, A. H. (1993). Estimating the effect of incentives on mail survey response rates: A meta-analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 62–79.
- Collins, R., Ellickson, P., Hays, R. D., & McCaffrey, D. F. (2000). Effects of incentive size and timing on response rates to a follow-up wave of a longitudinal mailed survey. *Evaluation Review*, 24(4), 347–363.
- Dillihunt, V. C. (1984). *Tactics and factors that increase response rates to mailed questionnaires*. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dillman, D. A., Christenson, J. A., Carpenter, E. H., & Brooks, R. (1974). Increasing mail questionnaire response: A four-state comparison. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 744–756.
- Elmore, R. F., & Rothman, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Testing, teaching, and learning: A guide for states and school districts*. Committee on Title I Testing and Assessment, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Flowers, C., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L., Browder, D., & Spooner, F. (2005). Teachers' perceptions of alternate assessments. *Research and Practice for Persons With Severe Disabilities*, 30(2), 81–92.
- Geenan, K., Thurlow, M., & Ysseldyke, J. (1995). *A disability perspective on five years of education reform*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center for Educational Outcomes.
- Goertz, M. E. (2001). Standards-based accountability: Horse trade or horse whip? In S. H. Fuhrman (Ed.), *From the Capitol to the classroom: Standards-based reform in the states*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Green, K. E., & Hutchinson, S. R. (1996). *Reviewing the research on mail survey response rates: Meta-analysis*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Gullatt, D. E. (2006). Block scheduling: The effects on curriculum and student productivity. National Association of Secondary School Principals, *NASSP Bulletin*, 90(3), 250–267.

- Heberlein, T. A. & Baumgartner, R. M. (1978). Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: A quantitative analysis of the published literature. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 447–462.
- Hopkins, K. D., & Gullickson, A. R. (1989). *Monetary gratuities in survey research*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Hopkins, K. D., & Gullickson, A. R. (1992). Response rates in survey research: A meta-analysis of the effects of monetary gratuities. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 61(1), 52–62.
- Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation. (2005 April 22). *Guidelines for incentives for NCEE impact evaluations*. Unpublished policy document.
- James, J. M., & Bolstein, R. (1990). The effect of monetary incentives and follow-up mailings on response rates and response quality in mail surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 54, 346–361.
- James, J. M., & Bolstein, R. (1992). Large monetary incentives and their effect on mail survey responses. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 56, 442–453.
- James, J. M., & Bolstein, R. (1990). The effect of monetary incentives and follow-up mailings on response rates and response quality in mail surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 54, 346–361.
- Karvonen, M., Flowers, C., Browder, D., Wakeman, S., & Algozzine, B. (2006). Case study of influences on alternate assessment outcomes for students with disabilities. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 41(2), 95–110.
- Karvonen, M., Flowers, C., Browder, D., & Wakeman, S. (2007). Measuring the enacted curriculum for students with significant cognitive disabilities: A preliminary investigation. *Assessment for Effective Intervention*, 33(1), 29–38.
- Marion, S., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2006). A validity framework for evaluating the technical quality of alternate assessments. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 25(4), 47–57.
- McLaughlin, M. J., & Thurlow, M. (2003). Educational accountability and students with disabilities: Issues and challenges. *Educational Policy*, 17(4), 431–451.
- Mirrel, J. (1994). High standards for all: The struggle for equality in the American high school curriculum. *American Educator*, 18 (2), 40–42.
- National Alternate Assessment Center (NAAC). (2007). *State department of educations' Curriculum Indicator Survey (CIS) results*. Charlotte, NC: Author.
- Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 724–736.
- Office of Management and Budget. (2006). *Questions and answers when designing surveys for information collections*. Retrieved April 1, 2008 from http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/pmc_survey_guidance_2006.pdf
- Quenemoen, R., Rigney, S., & Thurlow, M. (2002). *Use of alternate assessment results in reporting and accountability systems: Conditions for use based on research and practice* (Synthesis Report 43). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National

- Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved April 1, 2008, from <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Synthesis43.html>
- Resnick, L., & Zurawsky, C. (2005). Getting back on course: Standards-based reform and accountability. *American Educator*. Retrieved January 15, 2008, from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/american_educator/issues/spring05/resnick.htm
- Thompson, S., & Thurlow, M. (2001). *2001 state special education outcomes: A report on state activities at the beginning of a new decade*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved July 28, 2004, from <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/2001StateReport.html>
- Towles-Reeves, E., Kearns, J., Kleinert, H., & Kleinert, J. (in press). An analysis of the learning characteristics of students taking alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards. *Journal of Special Education*.
- Wakeman, S., Browder, D. M., Flowers, C., & Ahlgrim-Dezell, L. (2006). Principals' knowledge of fundamental and current issues in special education. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, NASSP Bulletin*, 90(2), 153–174.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wilde, J. B. (1988). *Survey research: Why respond?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.